Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice

Volume 21
Issue 2 *Intensive Modes of Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*

Article 01

2024

Editorial: Intensive modes of teaching, past, present, and future

Ian Solomonides
Victoria University, Australia, ian.solomonides@vu.edu.au

Gayani Samarawickrema
Victoria University, Australia, gayani.samarawickrema@vu.edu.au

Kaye Cleary
Victoria University, Australia, kaye.cleary@vu.edu.au

Sally Male
University of Melbourne, Australia, sally.male@unimelb.edu.au

Recommended Citation

Solomonides, I., Samarawickrema, G., Cleary, K., & Male, S. (2024). Editorial: Intensive modes of teaching, past, present, and future. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice, 21*(2). https://doi.org/10.53761/1.21.2.01

Editorial: Intensive modes of teaching, past, present, and future

Abstract

A recent overview and brief history of intensive modes of learning and teaching in higher education is presented, with implications for the design, application, impact, governance, and regulation of intensive mode teaching and learning. Previously limited to particular levels of study, or locations in the academic year, intensive modes as new forms of system-wide curriculum and organisation challenge the isomorphism of traditional, symmetrised organisations, while also being able to expand or complement conventional higher education. However, in whole-of-institution intensive mode settings, the importance of systematic awareness and application in adopting and sustaining intensive modes is highlighted, including the need to consider various process variables and pedagogic factors that may impact student learning. Prior research into correlations between these process dimension variables and learning gains offers some insights into the high-impact educational practices that are most likely to improve the quality of student learning outcomes – whether in intensive mode or otherwise. Systemic change requires careful planning, faculty development, and evolving assessment methodologies to ensure the success of intensive mode teaching and learning. Further research in areas such as change management, economics, graduate capabilities, pedagogies, wellness, equity, lifelong learning, and institutional responses would build a more robust evidence base for intensive modes of learning and teaching.

Practitioner Notes

1. In their modern forms, intensive modes of teaching offer challenges and opportunities for improving student learning outcomes.
2. Intensive modes operate within complex institutional systems that have a number of internal and external forces acting upon them.
3. Ensuring that intensive modes remain dynamic and contextualised to local environments optimises outcomes.
4. Process dimension variables are particularly important, ideally adopted through systematic and systemic incorporation.
5. Intensive modes are imagined and enacted in a number of ways, and further research and cross-institutional studies on intensive modes are encouraged.

Keywords

intensive teaching mode, history, curriculum design, change management, future research

Introduction

Learning from our past experiences, extrapolating knowledge, and theorising from it are typical of the academic endeavour and, in the case of this special edition, critical to progress our collective understandings related to intensive study modes. To date, there have been many publications and some dedicated conferences on various intensive modes of study. The aim of this Special Issue is to capture the zeitgeist associated with intensive modes of learning and teaching from practitioners and researchers with current experience of working in the field and to further promote conversation and advances regarding its design, application, impact, governance, and regulation, among other things.

This Special Issue presents a critical scholarly collection from the UK, the USA, and Australia. Intensive learning and teaching highlighted in the papers has a long history (Heist & Taylor, 1979) and has more recently gained significant interest in Australia (Goode et al., 2023; Kwan et al., 2022; Male, 2018; McCluskey et al., 2020), the UK (Buck & Tyrrell, 2022; Turner et al., 2021), Ethiopia (Sewagegn & Diale, 2021), and other parts of the world.

We invited contributions to seek diverse ideas and contradictory views to collectively progress our common interest in intensive modes of learning and teaching. As is customary, the manuscripts were assessed in a double-anonymised review process, and 10 papers from 19 submissions were selected for this Special Issue. Our different research profiles, learning and teaching experiences, and institutional leadership positions influenced and shaped this Special Issue. As Guest Editors of this Special Issue, we have enjoyed the challenge of bringing together a collection of articles that demonstrate the depth and breadth of ideas on issues related to intensive modes of learning and teaching.

Despite their varying approaches, our authors were clearly passionate about their work and keen to share their research and insights with the higher education community at large. They share case studies from their specific contexts, featuring critical areas such as assessment, engagement, international students, professional learning, work-integrated learning, and wellbeing. Although the papers are context specific, the findings are transferrable, relevant to the practitioner, and important to advance related understandings.

Background

Intensive modes of learning and teaching are variously described in the literature to include terms such as accelerated, block, immersive, and compressed. Various short-form courses of learning and teaching have emerged in higher education in response to students and organisations looking to provide courses of study that for whatever reason do not fit within a traditional semester calendar. Reasons cited for their application include, inter alia, flexibility to accommodate other demands, such as work, acceleration or remediation of learning,

Academic Editors

Section: Special Issue
Editor in Chief: Dr Joseph Crawford
Senior Editor: Dr Jo-Anne Kelder

Publication

Received: 15 November 2023
Revision: 20 November 2023
Accepted: 27 November 2023
Published: 31 January 2024

immersion on a topic in a concentrated way, simulation of work-based practice, accessibility, and overall time and cost savings.

The catalyst for this invited Special Issue was the HERDSA Guide (Samarawickrema et al., 2022) *Designing Learning for Intensive Modes of Study*, a review of which appears in this Special Issue. The guide shared good practice and provided examples of several intensive modes practised in Australia. Although practised in various forms and jurisdictions over several decades, contemporary interest in intensive modes of learning and teaching, especially in post-compulsory higher education, was enlivened following the implementation in Victoria University, Australia, of the Block Model in 2018 (characterised by sequential, one subject at a time, 4-week "blocks" of learning, teaching, and embedded assessment) and the subsequent reporting of its impact in local, national, and international media, attracting ongoing interest from around the world. Coupled with this and following on from the practice-based approach of the guide and the development of block-like intensive curricula and their organisation at other institutions, this Special Issue offers evidence-based recommendations based on diverse examples of practice in the sector.

Currently, most higher education systems follow similar patterns of organisation, and the majority of provision is built around the arranging of curricula into two semesters, typically with 13 weeks of teaching followed by summative assessment, with each semester timetabled either side of a long summer break. Within each semester, students often study four subjects concurrently and, with a few exceptions (increasingly, some institutions have moved to a trimester system), this "13x4" format prevails. The semester structure is, in the parlance of disruptive innovation (Christensen et al., 2015), a "sustaining innovation", and sustaining innovations are, culturally, very resistant to change. An isomorphic culture of traditional practices is evidenced across many institutions in the continued reliance on the semester system, content-heavy curricula, summative examination, lectures, and so on. Moreover, the tendency to rely on atheoretical approaches to teaching and learning in higher education, coupled with tradition, mean that much of what happens in universities when it comes to learning and teaching is based on custom and practice, sometimes decades, if not centuries, old.

Institutional Change

The Victoria University, Australia, example is one where an intensive mode is applied at the whole-of-institutional level. Once the principal domain of postgraduate and "summer school" offerings, a few higher education providers are adopting intensive mode as their primary calendar architecture. Since 2018, Victoria University has established block teaching across all of its undergraduate and postgraduate courses, making it the largest higher education provider of block teaching and learning anywhere in the world. However, it was not the first institution to adopt such a model. Scio College, USA, adopted a one-subject-at-a-time model between 1868 and 1867, and there is evidence of experiments in intensive mode learning and teaching in the late 19th and early 20th centuries (Carter, 2002; Scott & Conrad, 1992).

One of the earliest system-wide institution examples in more recent times is from Colorado College, USA (Scott & Conrad, 1992). Beginning in 1969–1970 and described as the Block Plan, Colorado College has since published a film on its history (Hayward, 2020), wherein the impetus

for the idea of doing one subject at a time was credited to Peter Drucker's (1966) writings on time management and organisation. Other US colleges followed, including Cornell College in 1978 and the University of Montana Western in 2005. Konjarski et al. (2023) provide a useful comparison of the block institutions above, suggesting that "the adoption of a plan as radical as the Block forces an institution to question every part of its operation" (p. 9). In 2007, Quest University, Canada, opened. Quest operated until 2023 entirely under its own block plan, with a campus infrastructure designed specifically to support block learning and teaching and a curriculum that involved students developing and then focusing on a personalised question rather than traditional majors.

In 2020–2021 Southern Cross University, Australia, piloted its version of intensive mode curricula and organisation, adopting a 6x6 model, whereby subjects are organised into 6-week "terms" with students typically studying two subjects per term (Roche et al., 2022, and as further discussed in this Special Issue). At the time of writing, Randolph College, USA, is moving to 7-week blocks, and to date, there are also a number of UK universities moving to the block model, including De Montfort University, England (De Montfort University, 2022), the University of Suffolk, England (Buck & Tyrrell, 2022), and the University of Plymouth, England. Other institutions have satellite campuses that are or will be operating a block model such as Nottingham Trent University, England (at Mansfield), and the University of Portsmouth, England (at London). It is assumed that several other institutions across a number of jurisdictions are either contemplating moving to or are already teaching in intensive modes, but these are not widely publicised or visible. As described in the guide, there is a growing corpus of materials and experience available on intensive modes of learning. Victoria University, Australia, established a number of principles to guide the development of the Victoria University Block Model – principles, it is argued, that have a sound underpinning in educational theory and practice, especially when viewed through a systems theory lens, as briefly discussed as follows.

Systems Thinking

By viewing educational institutions, processes, and learning environments as complex systems, educators and administrators can gain deeper insights into the intricate relationships and interactions that shape the educational experience. This perspective allows for a holistic analysis of the interconnected components within institutions, such as curriculum, teaching methods, student dynamics, and institutional policies. Graham Gibbs (2010, 2012) reviewed and summarised various multivariate research studies of the vast amounts of data available that report on the quality dimensions that can be used to compare different educational settings and their impact on the quality of student learning. In doing so, he, like **Lodge and Ashford-Rowe** in this Special Issue, appropriated John Biggs's "3P" model (Biggs, 1993) of "presage", "process", and "product" (similarly, input-process-output) to categorise and qualify the variables that are most likely to have an impact on student learning outcomes and educational gain. Unsurprisingly, process variables were deemed most critical:

> *What best predicts educational gain is measures of educational process: what institutions do with their resources to make the most of whatever students they have. The process variables that best predict gains are not to do with the facilities themselves, or to do with*

> *student satisfaction with these facilities, but concern a small range of fairly well-understood pedagogical practices that engender student engagement.* (Gibbs, 2010, p. 5)

A summary of these input, process, and output variables described by Gibbs (2010) and their relative impact on educational gain is presented in Table 1 (Solomonides, 2017).

Table 1

Predictors of Educational Gain

Do not predict how much students learn	Do predict how much students learn
Selectivity (predicts performance, effort, etc., not learning gain or engagement).	Student effort and their sophistication as learners (spending time on the right things).
Research performance.	Smaller cohort and class sizes.
Reputation (predicts selectivity, funding, research, and employability but not gain).	Who does the teaching (e.g., full-time educators, not part-time or PhD students).
Peer ratings of teaching (tend to reflect reputation).	Timely and impactful feedback (must feed forward).
Class contact hours (there is no correlation between CCH and learning gain).	Close contact with teachers (e.g., how much oral feedback received).
Student satisfaction (e.g., can be negatively correlated with effort expected).	Collaborative and active learning.
	Clear, high, and consistent expectations.

As **Lodge and Ashford-Rowe** describe in the Commentary to this Special Issue, there is often, in policy, regulation, and funding, an overemphasis on the inputs and outputs of higher education (typically those variables in the left column of Table 1) at the expense of process variables (typically those variables in the right column of Table 1). These process variables and predictors of educational gain, along with other key findings on high-impact teaching and organisational practices (e.g., Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Kuh, 2008; Smith & Baik, 2001; Thomas, 2012; Trowler, 2010), heavily informed the principles underpinning the Victoria University Block Model and can be seen to have influenced several of the innovations described in this Special Issue. As such, these knowledges are increasingly being built into the principles of learning and teaching adopted in organisation and practice and especially so for those developing courses in intensive mode.

However, it may also be argued that many of the foci for improving student success have leant toward the maintenance of student-focused hygiene factors that are typically bundled under terms such as “student engagement” or “sense of belonging”. Although these phenomena are and remain key ingredients to promote student satisfaction and retention (see, e.g., Crawford et al., 2023; Nugent et al., 2019), they risk remaining incidental unless they are part of a wider and sustained systemic approach that touches every aspect of institutional practice geared toward maximising the quality of student learning outcomes. Biggs (1999) makes a similar point:

> *Learning outcomes are determined by a whole complex of factors … All these factors affect each other, forming an interactive system (Biggs, 1993b). Any system, such as an*

> *eco-system has to be understood as a whole. Components have to be considered as they affect each other, not as acting separately or additively.* (Biggs, 1999, p. 61)
>
> *… there is maximum consistency throughout the system. … All components in the system address the same agenda and support each other. The students are "entrapped" in this web of consistency, optimising the likelihood that they will engage the appropriate learning activities.* (Biggs, 1999, p. 64)

Therefore, to achieve maximum impact, the incorporation of these process dimensions is dependent on a wide range of institutional practices, processes, and culture, requiring systematic and systemic adoption if they are to be truly embedded. This in turn raises concerns about how best to manage and drive institutional change, especially when considering intensive mode as the primary teaching and learning approach and calendar architecture. A great deal is known about, for example, high-impact teaching practices. What is less well known is how best to drive institutional change for the incorporation of these and other system variables. As we state below, this is an area that deserves further investigation and examples of best practice in the literature. With an increasing number of institutions adopting intensive modes of learning and teaching, either in part or in whole, there is a growing opportunity and urgency for such research to take place.

The Special Issue and Future Studies

The articles in this Special Issue provide a series of case studies on intensive modes of learning and teaching arising from innovations in the area over the last decade. Consistent with the need to provide timely stakeholder-relevant improvements, these papers are mostly institution-specific and are examples of the timely capturing of unfolding innovations. They draw data from stakeholders and are responses to inform iterative improvements. Several authors investigate the stresses, the distresses, and the successes of the struggle when transitioning to intensive study modes. The first six articles in this issue focus on intensive approaches responding to challenges to engage and capture students in learning. The kernel of learning commences with a sense of belonging of a student within their institution and career. The notion of belonging is critical in enhancing students' ability to learn. **Long and McLaren** sensitively explore this in a context of marginalised students. A common lever to engage students in learning is meaningful assessment. Both students and staff need confidence in the effectiveness of assessment regimes. **Braga, Ortiz-Granero, and Buck** examine similarities and differences that both parties bring to the assessment of learning. A fraught area to engage students in learning is collaborative group work. **Newell and van Antwerpen** investigate this challenge through a more recent lens of students as partners. In contrast, work-integrated learning, a well-established practice to engage students in learning, is surveyed by **Winchester-Seeto, Ferns, Lucas, Piggott, and Rowe** to identify its advantages and complications within an intensive mode of study. Though these are all attempts to understand engagement strategies within an intensive learning environment, **Dempsey-Willis and Braga** explore student engagement more broadly. **Goode, Roche, Wilson, Zhang, and McKenzie** focus on a specific cohort, international students, a vulnerable group warranting special attention when learning intensively in a foreign country. Academics' perspectives of transitioning to teaching intensively are key to effectively engage students in their learning. **Turner, Cotton, Danvers, Morrison, and Kneale** explore academics' responses.

Since little was known within the institutional context about intensive modes of teaching, **Samarawickrema, Cleary, and Gauci** investigate how professional learning staff develop their own capabilities to then provide credible, contextualised staff development for their academic colleagues. Additionally, support services have collaborated to provide integrated capacity building that extends beyond an individual service. This partnering is described by **Baker, Christopher, and Noah** as their institution temporarily transitioned to intensive study during COVID-19. The final article in this Special Issue by **Roche, Wilson, and Goode** examines aligning whole-of-institution resources and focuses on policies, processes, and infrastructures.

Although the papers in this Special Issue are significant contributions to the field, we note that additional large-scale cross-institutional studies are needed to build on Australian cross-institutional studies (Crispin et al., 2016; Male, 2018; Male et al., 2020). Additionally, while a few institutional studies are emerging (Cleary et al., 2023), we ask, have we so far been researching and measuring what is easy to research and measure? Although there is a growth in investigations on intensive modes of study, we recognise the need for further evidence-based research on many fronts, examples of which are summarised in Table 2.

Table 2

Opportunities for Further Research and Enquiry

Focus area	Examples
Change management	What lessons have we learned about change management to achieve stakeholder support and realign institutional policies and procedures? What is the role of key professional, statutory, regulatory, or other stakeholders, and how are connections with these bodies fostered and maintained?
Economics	What are the economics and efficiencies of various models of intensive offers? How can institutional structures efficiently favour and support intensive learning?
Capabilities	How are graduate capabilities fostered in intensive modes of study? To what extent are graduates contributing to solving problems for people, responding to national or global issues, such as climate change? How does intensive mode learning and teaching prepare students to take leadership positions, be entrepreneurial, and to adapt to changing demands? How can intensive modes be better exploited to find improved ways of driving partnerships between the university sector and the industry sector? To what extent do intensive course structures give students the skills and the scope to be job ready?
Disciplines	Are there discipline areas that lend themselves to intensive modes of study? For example, Murray et al. (2020) argue that teaching filmmaking in intensive mode approximates the intensity and urgency of the discipline. Nevertheless, the debate continues about teaching content-heavy disciplines with professional bodies (e.g., law, engineering) and survey-type disciplines such as arts, literature, and other creative subjects that call for new ways of doing

	and thinking. What evidence is available to guide current debate on this topic?
Pedagogies	What are the empowering pedagogies for learning in intensive modes? What is the relationship between learning and study duration?
Wellness	What strategies are recommended for managing the wellbeing of both students and educators?
Connections	How do small classes and social learning influence sustainable connections in intensive learning? What impact does this have on sense of belonging and community or networking post-graduation? How can intensive models be thoughtfully designed to gain greater participation from Indigenous students, systematically marginalised students, or other equity groups?
Lifelong learning	How and to what extent do intensive modes contribute to continuing professional development and lifelong learning?
Institutional research	What longitudinal studies are in the pipeline? A critical investigation of the lived experiences of educators and students would make a useful contribution to all institutions engaged in intensive delivery. Smaller scale research projects can inform enhancement of learning and teaching and should be encouraged, but how is this cumulative knowledge taken further?

We acknowledge that despite its long history, our knowledge of intensive modes of learning and teaching is immature and evolving. This Special Issue is one effort at building and encouraging a research base in the area, thus adding to its credibility. Our call is for an evidence base of long-term studies to establish and critique cause and effect and to further examine the contextual variables that maximise success in intensive teaching and learning.

Intensive modes of learning and teaching expand and complement what conventional higher education can offer. The future of intensive modes in higher education is promising. The contributions in this Special Issue highlight the need for careful planning, continuous evaluation, and a commitment to quality. Institutions should invest in faculty development to ensure educators are well equipped to deliver dynamic and engaging intensive courses. Simultaneously, they must embrace evolving assessment methodologies that accurately gauge students' comprehension and critical thinking abilities within the confines of an accelerated time frame.

We hope the papers in this Special Issue are of interest to practitioners and researchers alike. Our aim is to promote discussion and reflective critique in this evolving multidimensional space to gain a broader understanding of the potentials and pitfalls, and to inform future strategic plans. We thank the authors of the articles, reviewers who generously shared their insights, perspectives, and time, and the editorial team for their guidance. We are grateful for the contributions of all.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no actual or perceived conflicts of interest and have not received any funding to create this Special Issue. This editorial was produced without artificial intelligence support.

References

Biggs, J. B. (1993). From theory to practice: A cognitive systems approach. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *12*(1), 73–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/0729436930120107

Biggs, J. B. (1999). What the student does: Teaching for enhanced learning. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *18*(1), 57–75. https://doi.org/10.1080/0729436990180105

Buck, E., & Tyrrell, K. (2022). Block and blend: A mixed method investigation into the impact of a pilot block teaching and blended learning approach upon student outcomes and experience. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *46*(8), 1078–1091. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2022.2050686

Carter, M. W. (2002) *Comparisons of traditional and block schedules on the ACT mathematics test and algebra I state examinations* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Tennessee. https://trace.tennessee.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=8165&context=utk_graddiss

Chickering, A., W. & Gamson, Z., F. (1987) Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *Washington Centre News* https://www.lonestar.edu/multimedia/sevenprinciples.pdf

Christensen, C. M., Raynor, M. E., & McDonald, M. (2015, December). What is disruptive innovation? *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/2015/12/what-is-disruptive-innovation

Cleary, K., Samarawickrema, G., Ambler, T., Loton, D., Krcho, T., & McCluskey, T. (2023). Transitioning to emergency remote teaching in a block mode curriculum: A case study of academics' experiences in an Australian university. *British Journal of Educational Studies*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2023.2248289

Crawford, J., Allen, K.-A., Sanders, T., Baumeister, R., Parker, P., Saunders, C., & Tice, D. (2023). Sense of belonging in higher education students: An Australian longitudinal study from 2013 to 2019. *Studies in Higher Education*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2023.2238006

Crispin, S., Hancock, P., Male, S. A., Baillie, C., MacNish, C., Leggoe, J., Ranmuthugala, D., & Alam, F. (2016). Threshold capability development in intensive mode business units. *Education & Training*, *58*(5), 521–539. https://doi.org/10.1108/et-02-2016-0033

De Montfort University. (2022). *Education 2030: Imagining what education needs to be in 2030, and delivering it now*. https://www.dmu.ac.uk/empowering-university/edu2030/index.aspx

Drucker, P. F. (1966). *The effective executive: The definitive guide to getting things done*. Pan Piper.

Gibbs, G. (2010). *Dimensions of quality*. The Higher Education Academy. https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/dimensions-quality

Gibbs, G. (2012). *Implications of 'Dimensions of Quality' in a market environment*. The Higher Education Academy. https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/implications-dimensions-quality-market-environment

Goode, E., Roche, T., Wilson, E., & McKenzie, J. W. (2023). Implications of immersive scheduling for student achievement and feedback. *Studies in Higher Education Sciences*, *48*(7), 1123–1136. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2023.2184472

Hayward, S. (2020). *The Block Plan: Celebrating 50 years of innovative, immersive learning*. Colorado College. https://vimeo.com/511210445

Heist, P., & Taylor, M. F. (1979). *The Block Plan: A preliminary report on a ten-year evaluation of the Colorado College block plan format for intensive study*. Colorado College.

Konjarski, L., Weldon, J., Ashley, S., Freeman, T., Shanata, J., Yamanishi, M., Lotz, E., Gilde, C., & Ganzel, A. (2023). The block: A catalyst for ongoing innovation. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, *20*(4), Article 13. https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.4.13

Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter.* Association of American Colleges and Universities. https://provost.tufts.edu/celt/files/High-Impact-Ed-Practices1.pdf

Kwan, P., Memon, T. D., Hashmi, S. S., Rhode, F., & Kadel, R. (2022). An empirical study of students' perception of and key factors affecting overall satisfaction in an intensive block mode and flipped classroom. *Education Sciences*, *12*(8), Article 535. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12080535

Male, S. (2018). *Student experiences of threshold capability development with intensive mode teaching: Final report.* Australian Government Department of Education and Training. https://ltr.edu.au/resources/SP14-4624_Male_Report_2018.pdf

Male, S. A., Crispin, S., & Hancock, P. (2020). Intensive mode teaching explained using threshold concepts. In J. A. Timmermans & R. Land (Eds.), *Threshold concepts on the edge* (pp. 101–112). Brill Sense. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004419971_007

McCluskey, T., Smallridge, A., Weldon, J., Loton, D., Samarawickrema, G., & Cleary, K. (2020). Building on the VU block foundations: Results from the inaugural first year cohort. In E. Heinrich & R. Bourke (Eds.), *Research and development in higher education: Vol. 42: Next generation, higher education: Challenges, changes and opportunities* (pp. 61–72). Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia. https://www.herdsa.org.au/publications/conference-proceedings/research-and-development-higher-education-next-generation-6

Murray, T., Barkat, I., Pearlman, K., & Robinson, L. (2020). Intensive mode screen production: An Australian case study in designing university learning and teaching to mirror 'real-world' creative production processes. *Media Practice and Education*, *21*(1), 18–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741136.2019.1644842

Nugent A., Lodge, J. M., Carroll, A., Bagraith, R., MacMahon, S., Matthews, K. E., & Sah, P. (2019). *Higher education learning framework: An evidence-informed model for university learning*. The University of Queensland. https://doi.org/10.14264/348c85f

Roche, T., Wilson, E., & Goode, E. (2022). *Why the Southern Cross Model? How one university's curriculum was transformed*. Southern Cross University Scholarship of Learning & Teaching Research Paper No. 3. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4029237

Samarawickrema, G., Cleary, K., Male, S., & McCluskey, T. (2022). *Designing learning for intensive modes of study*. Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia. https://www.herdsa.org.au/publications/guides/designing-learning-intensive-modes-study

Scott, P. A., & Conrad, C. F. (1992). A critique of intensive courses and an agenda for research. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 411–459). Agathon Press.

Sewagegn, A. A., & Diale, B. M. (2021). Modular/Block teaching: Practices and challenges at higher education institutions of Ethiopia. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *26*(6), 776–789. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2019.1681391

Smith, C. D. & Baik, C. (2021). High-impact teaching practices in higher education: A best evidence review. *Studies in Higher Education*, *46*(8), 1696–1713. http://doi.org.10.1080/03075079.2019.1698539

Solomonides, I. (2017). *First year college model – Discussion paper on application of principles* [Unpublished internal document]. Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia.

Thomas, L. (2012). *Building student engagement and belonging in higher education at a time of change: Final report from the What Works? Student Retention & Success programme.* Paul Hamlyn Foundation. https://www.phf.org.uk/publications/works-student-retention-success-final-report/

Trowler, V. (2010). *Student engagement literature review*. The Higher Education Academy. https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/student-engagement-literature-review

Turner, R., Webb, O. J., & Cotton, D. R. E. (2021). Introducing immersive scheduling in a UK university: Potential implications for student attainment. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *45*(10), 1371–1384. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2021.1873252